G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—22-7-14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

~~191~~ 1894-5
(Courts)

File No. 42 of 94-5

Serial Nos. 1-14.

~~Papers Filed.~~

~~Month~~ _____

SUBJECT.

Payment of fees to the Govt. Advocate for having conducted a civil case filed by Veerasangappa & others against mr. V. N. Narasimha Iyengar.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
	Judged B. Venkatasubbiah Commissioner

Office Copy

Of the ~~Four~~ Bills ~~have been forwarded~~ referred to (1) the Govt Advocate, ~~the~~ Comptroller's Office has sent four. (9)

Bill marked I.

Court	Appearances	Total Amount
Sub Judge of Bangalore in O.S. No 206 of 1888	(1) 11-12-88 (2) 17-1-89 (3) 19-2-89 (4) 16-4-89 (5) 15-8-89 (6) 12-9-89 (7) 17-10-89 (8) 21-11-89 (9) 19-12-89 (10) 21-12-89 (11) 16-1-90. (12) 9-1-90	Rs 100-11-4

Bill marked II

Sub Judge of Bangalore in O.S. No 284 of 1889	(1) 25-7-89 (2) 22-8-89	Rs 100-0-0

Bill marked III

Chief Court of Mysore in Refers Case No 1 of 1889	(1) 22-7-89	Rs 50-0-0

Bill marked IV

Chief Court of Mysore in Civil Appeal No 49 of 1889	(1) 10-4-1889	Rs 50-0-0

3/2/90

1/4/1890

(10)

To
The Dt. Registrar
Nandidrug Dt.

Has the honour to request that the Dt. Registrar will be so good as to forward copy of the decree passed in O.S. No. 14 of 1951-52 on the file of his Court, as the same is wanted in connection with the question of the fees payable to the Govt. Advocate in that case.

4/1/52.

-X. Vakalatnama & other papers in V.V. Narasimhaiya.

Dt. Court to send the copy of decree asked for by the petitioner
Sd/- illegible for
Secy. to Govt.
Legislative Dept.
5/1/52

Note (13)

The ~~nominal~~ amount of the suit is Rs 5100.

The Govt. Advocate claims Rs 1120 as fees, at 50 Rs each for 14 appearances and 16 Rs each for 9 appearances.

Govt. order No 121-54 dy 7-9 2-7-95 (serial no 9) shows that, ~~except~~ when the fee awarded by law is less than Rs 16, an Advocate engaged on behalf of Govt. is not entitled to more than the Court has awarded. What this is in the present case has not been stated.

There are no special rules for the Govt. Advocate, so far as the papers put up show.

Govt. ~~Order~~ orders.

4/1/98.

I am told that there are instances of the Accountant having received Rs 50 per allowance. But the papers do not show.

6-1-98

Govt. pleader 12/3/98

P.T.O.

Re Veiled Boy Hayawan.

Please see copy of the decree - it does not show that the costs were awarded - ll

11/3/98

It is now ordered that the arguments were granted unopposed by the Govt. adv. and some at any rate for the convenience or short of opp. Under any circumstances the rule laid down in Govt. of India Govt. Order No 121 that the fees allowable 54 for adv. applies also in this case. If a private adv. is entitled to claim only the fees allowable by rules in that respect to the number of adv. a Govt. adv. who is retained by Govt. by being allowed a fixed monthly pay cannot normally claim separate fees for adv.

Carry sanction to the last of the fee mentioned in the decree with the observation that separate fees for adv. are not claimable for reasons stated above. Draft for appeal

11. 3. 98

Subhedar:

Please see office note attached, which shows that the previous Govt Advocate has been paid at the rate of 50 Rs per appearance in 3 cases; but in another case involving 12 appearances, he only claimed and got Rs 100 in all.

Under the order of 2-7-95, no more than the fees awarded by the Court can be claimed. A draft calling for information on this point is put up (as also called for by the Offg Dewan on the unanswered [illegible] to be seen.)

6/7/98

from the copy of the note submitted by the Govt Advocate, the fees awarded by the Court to the Govt Advocate appear to be only Rs 252.

Subhedar 10/7/98

The fee ordinarily payable to an Advocate appearing on behalf of Govt in a civil suit or proceeding in the Court for decision is a minimum of Rs 16. In the present case it was the Govt Advocate that appeared & not an ordinary Advocate on 3 occasions the former Govt Advocate was paid at the rate of 50 Rs per appearance. Mr R. Iyer accordingly claims 50 Rs per day on which this case was heard & 16 Rs for every day on which the case was adjd. The case was a very important one but the claim does not seem quite admissible. A lump sum of Rs 500 may, if allowed by the Dewan be sanctioned in this case, & a rule may be laid down that the Govt Advocate's fee shall be 32 Rs for every day on which actually heard & 10 Rs for every other appearance.

Subhedar 14-7-98

I would leave this question entirely to the judgment of the Offg Dewan who has so much experience in these matters.

Madhava Rao
26/7/98

I don't see why the order of 2-7-95 should not apply to a Govt Advocate as to any other Advocate appearing in a Court of Law. If the Govt Advocate is entitled to claim Rs 50 per appearance in the High Court, he may also be allowed the same fee in the Sessions Court.

11. 8. 98

(13)

I Rec'd

I am to state that the Govt. have received the Govt. Pleader's claim on fee for attendance on behalf of Govt. in Civil Court — and to request that the Chief Court may be moved to direct the payment of the fee claimed from the Provincial Revenues.

Please see my note [illegible]

Chief Court

Yes pr apte Govt-advo - call & pr appearance in the Chief Court - C.

Refer Subd. (Please see Serial Nos. (3/a) & (3/b) in J 7 No. 185-92 and Govt Pro: No. 577 B-dy 30/3/92 Secretariat Pro: No. 60 Dy 2 9-3-98.

Subd Order

The Govt pleader's claim is for appearance before the Chief Court. The present case refers to the Govt Advocate's appearance in the District Court, for which he seems entitled to claim fees.

Subd 10/3/98

Secretariat 9/3/98.

Govt advocate's claim forwarded pr 3/a 9/3/98

SECTION C.S.

FILE No. 42 of 94 20.

SERIAL No. 1

(1)

6873 ene One
J 391

Dated 1-11-94.

The Govt Advocate

Sir,

I am directed to forward the accompanying Notice sent by Santamalla Devaru and four others of Mysore Town to Mr. V. N. Narasim Iyengar, Ex-Census Superintendent in Mysore, intimating that proceedings would be taken against him for publishing in the Census Report, 1891, certain statements defamatory of the

Lingayat Sect to which the writers of the Notice belong, and to request you to ~~take the needful instructions from~~ Counsel Mr. Narasimi Iyengar on his behalf and to send them a reply ~~in the manner dictated by him~~ denying the liabilities & stating that the statements made in the proper authority & without malice

2. In the event of any proceedings being hereafter taken by the writers of the Notice against Mr. Narasimi Iyengar, I am to authorize you to appear for the Defendant and conduct the ~~case~~ Defence of Gyan Sphere ~~accepted~~ under ~~his instructions~~.

I have &c.

1/11/94

For Chief Secy

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

1894 J. 581

No. Ph. 240 (2)

Name of Petitioner. Veerasangappa & other Veerasiva sect people.

SECTION C&C — Village.

FILE NO. 42 of 96 — Taluk.

SERIAL NO. 2 — District.

Date of Arzi 15 Oct.

Date of Receipt. 9 Nov.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. one

Two Rupees Stamp affixed

ABSTRACT.

Enclose a copy of the notice served by them on Mr. V. N. Narasimhaiengar, Census Superintendent, for deciding their sect in the Census Report Part I & pray for special permission to file a regular suit against Mr. Narasimhaiengar in the proper Court.

Register and have replied.

File

Original summons. signed. Return it to the Dt Judge in a letter.

2. Transfer these papers to the Asst Govt Advocate for disposal as per Govt orders already Communicated

No: 4806/565 91

Transferred for disposal to the Asst Govt Advocate vide Govt order no 6873/391 dated 1-11-94.

By order

(Signed) V. N. Narasimmayyangar
General Secretary.

28-10-95.

2896 L
3480

Gen. 31.]

1895

3

SECTION Bl c
FILE NO. 420 of 94 Po
SERIAL NO. 3

From The Dt Judge, Nandidrug Division

To V. N. Narasimmayyangar Esq. General secretary to the Govt of Mysore, Bangalore.

Dated 14th October 95
Despatched 15th —
Received

General No. 877
No. 154

Enclosure No. 4

Forwards summons in C.S. no: 14 of 1895-96, on the file of this Court, and requests that the original returned with due endorsement thereon.

5

No: 4807/3566 of 29-10-95

(4)

SECTION 66

FILE No. 42 of 94

SERIAL No. 4 Li,

To

The District Judge
Trincomalee Division

I have the honour to return herewith duly ~~signed~~ served the summons in O.S. No 14 of 1895-96 on the file of your Court, received with your letter No 877/154 dated 14th October 1895.

I have the honour

28-10-95.

General Secretary

General Serial No. 30.

9 741

OFFICE OF THE 4792 2-12-97 189 5 N OF MYSORE 6

SECTION Lds

FILE NO. 620 of 94

SERIAL NO. 5

From The Government Advocate in Mysore

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore

Dated

Despatched 29th November 1897

Received in J Branch 2-12-97

Enclosures No.

General No. 98
No.

Reporting the result of the suit filed by Venkatasangappah & Others against the Census Superintendent

13/12/97

Jr
2.12.97
Refer put up.
BM
Sub. 6 this Sec 4-12-97
4/12

Sd/ 6/12/97

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—6-3-97.—10,002.

No 98

Office of the Government Advocate
in Mysore

5

From

The Government Advocate
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Sir,

I have the honor to report that
the suit which was filed by Veerasang:
appah & others against Mr. V. N.
Narsimha Iyengar, as Census Superintend.
in the Court of the District Judge,
Nundidroog Division for libel and
damages was heard & Judgment
pronounced today dismissing the
Plaintiffs' suit with Costs.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.

S Ramaswamy
Government Advocate.

O/C 6783-85 dt 11-12-97 put up as Mis 1408 hence sent returned and sent to Govt. Advocate for perusal and return of the papers herewith received with his letter dt 13-12-97 for appearing therein (vide entry in Consolidated Register) DMR 18/12/97

General Serial No. 30.

805

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE 189

6225
14-12-97

From The Government Advocate in Mysore

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore

SECTION Rls
FILE NO. 42 of 94
SERIAL NO. 6
Dated 13th December 1897
Despatched
Received 14-12-97

Enclosures No. 2

General No. 105
No.

Submitting for sanction a bill of fees in connection with O.S. No 14 of 1895-96 on the file of the District Judge Nundidrug Division

Ind Letter No. 98 dt 29/11/97 from the G. Advocate reporting the result of the suit was sent to Dewan on 6-12-97 DMR 15/12/97

Further orders regarding fees of Government Advocate in the case and the orders thereon sent to Dewan's office DMR 16/12/97

Precedent sent DMR 18/12/97

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—6-3-97.—10,002.

Bangalore
13th December 1897

No 105

Encl No 2

(6)

From

The Government Advocate
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Sir,

I have the honor to enclose herein a Bill for my fees in O.S. No 14 of 1895-96, on the file of the District Judge, Nundidroog Division. Out of the 22 appearances, on 8 occasions as the Case was simply adjourned and nothing was done I have Charged for the appearance at 16 Rs: per day & for the remaining 14 appearances I have Charged at 50 Rs: per day.

The amount of the Bill is Rs 5100.

In the Certificate of the
District Court, the District

10

District Judge States on 5 dates the appearances of the parties or their Advocates are not noted. Mr Cress was then the Judge & Mr Vorhaus Rec heard the Case only from the 18th October 1897, but the Proceedings on the said 5 dates show that I should have appeared. For instance on the 10th August 1897, the Plaintiff & Defendant were recalled and Examined. This necessarily shows that I should have been present to Examine them & beg to state that I did appear on those 5 days.

I request that the bill may be passed.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
S Ramaswamy
Government Advocate

189 (7)

From

The ~~General~~ Secretary to the

Government of Mysore.

SECTION 615

FILE NO. 42 & 94 To

SERIAL NO. 7

To The Comptroller in Mysore

Dated 18th Jany 1898

Despatched

Received ✓

General No. 8/97

Enclosure No. 943

Has the honor to forward herewith ~~the~~ a Memo received from the office of the Govt. Advocate in Mysore, and to request the Comptroller will be good enough to forward for perusal and return the bills in original, if available, referred to therein, if available.

B. O.

17/1/98

for Secty

^ relating to certain bills for fees payable ~~Stamp~~ to the Advocate,

13

No 5-167 Rev 5

Recd DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER, MYSORE GOVT.

Bangalore, 25 January 1848

26 JAN. 48 MYSORE

From Hy Bowring Esqre

~~E R. SUBRAYER, Esq.,~~

Offg. Comptroller, Mysore Govt.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,

Revenue & Genl Dept.s

Sir,

With reference to your No. 8197/943 dated 18th instant I have the honor to forward herewith the marginally noted four bills referred to in the list herewith returned and to state that the remaining bill for Rs 5 of said to have been paid on 4th August 1847 will

J 990 12

64440
28-1-98

DEPARTMENT

189

8

SECTION 31

FILE No. 2 [illegible]

SERIAL No. 2

From

The Comptroller, Mysore Govt.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,

Dept.

Dated

Despatched

Received 1-2-98

No.

No.

SUBJECT MATTER.

Forwarding 4 bills, Expenses & in the Civil

G 28/1/98

G. Jus

Refer put up

MB

1-2-98.

1 Acting Govt advocates bill for hovering appeared in O.S. No 2066 of 1888
in the file of the Sub Judge Bangalore for Rs 100/.

2. Do - bill for hovering appeared in O.S. No ~~1~~ 2? 84 of 1889
in the file of the Sub Judge Bangalore for Rs ~~50~~ Rs 100? /.

3. Do —— bill for hovering appeared in Case No 1 of
1889 in the file of the Chief Court - for Rs 50/.

4. Govt advocates bill for hovering appeared in
Civil appeal No 49 of 1889 in the file of Chief Court for Rs 50/

the subsmitted in
the Course.
I have the honour to be
Sir
Your humble obedient Servant
B Coles
Offg Govt Solr
Bl

(11)

To

The Govt. Advocate in Kandy

No. 916-2 / 1026 dt 5-2-98.

(His letter No. 105 dt 14-1-98)

SECTION 6l8

FILE No. 42/894

SERIAL No. 9

submitting for sanction a bill of fees in connection with O.S. No. 14 of 1095 on the file of the D.C. Kandy, Nawalapitiya.

With reference to the above has the honour to request the Govt. Advocate to be good enough to apply for and obtain a copy of the decree of the Court in the above case and to submit the same for the information of Govt.

5/2/98

I have the honour

6836
9 1055

16

No 138

Encl 1

Office of the Government
Advocate in Mysore

SECTION Ltrs
FILE No. 420794
SERIAL No. 10
12

From

The Government Advocate
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your letter
No. 9152, dated 5th August 1
1896
have the honor to enclose herein a
certified copy of the decree in O.S.
No. 14 of 1895-96 on the file of the
District Judge, Nundidroog Division

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant
S Ramaswamy
Government Advocate



(12/a) 17

Enclosure to Sl. 10.

In the Court of the District Judge
Bandy Drug Division
Bangalore

Original Suit No 14 of 95-96

1. Veerasungappa of Mysore
2. N. R. Karibasavaiachary of Mysore
3. Chicka Sivalingaswamy of T. Narsipur T.K.
4. Hoochappa of T. Narsipur,
5. Viroopakshappa of Mysore
6. Santhaveerappa of Bangalore
7. Giraeppanna of Bidadi
8. Hoochaveerappa of Bidadi
9. Yeyman Pottanna of Yedatoray
10. Gubbanna of Mysore
11. Chennabasavappa of Mysore
12. Siddaramanna of Tumkur
13. Basavalingappa of Channapatna
14. Madappa of Anekal
15. Gungashetty of Bidadi
16. Chennashetty of Bidadi
17. Veerabadria of Bidadi
18. P. Pichanna of Yedatoray

Plaintiffs

Pages 1 to 3.

16

(12 TR)

19. Pookkanna of yedatoray
20. Vishakuntia of Tumkur
21. Goorooswamappa of T. Narsipur

} Plffs

&

Mr. V. N. Narsimiengar, General Secretary to the Government of Mysore, Bangalore } defendant

Claim to recover Rs 5,100-- on account of damages.

On the passing of judgment in this suit in the presence of Mr. Ganapadharia for Mr. Krishna Murti Row, Advocate for the plaintiffs, and Mr. Ramaswamy Iyer, Advocate for the defendant - It is ordered and decreed that the plaintiffs' suit be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs. And it is further ordered and decreed that the plaintiffs Veeraeungappa and 20 others do pay to the defendant the sum of Rs 252--, being the amount of costs incurred in this suit, as by Memorandum annexed

Given under my hand and the Seal of the Court this the 29th day of November 1897.

(Sgd) J. Karahari Row
District Judge

Memorandum of costs incurred in this Suit

	By the Plaintiffs			By the Defendant		
Court fee on plaint	285	"	"	"	"	"
" on replication	3	"	"	"	"	"
Power of attorney	"	8	"	"	"	"
" Written Statement	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Exhibits	"	"	"	"	"	"
" Processes	28	8	"	"	"	"
Subsistence for witnesses	121	14	"	"	"	"
Advocates fee	252	"	"	252	"	"
Costs of Adjournments	"	"	"	"	"	"
Fees for copying Translating	11	13	2	"	"	"
Total Rupees	702	11	2	252	"	"

Amount payable by the plaintiffs to the defendant, on account of costs, is Rs 252/-

(Sgd) J. Karahari Row
District Judge

(Copy)

Counsel
for Sheristadar

DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT
ST. KITTS

Date of application 7-2-98

" when stamp put 9-2-98

" when ready 8-2-98

" of delivery—9—2—98.

Ananth

for Christadas.

Lowfwords 210

Amount .—4—6

Postage .—1—.

Paper .—.—6

.—6—.

(14)

Read

Correspondence ending with Letter No. 130 dt 10-2-98 from the Government Advocate in Mysore, with regard to his bill for Rs 0250, ~~on account~~ being fees claimed for appearing on behalf of Govt in O.S. no. 14 of 1095-96 on the file of the District Judge of Mandya Dn.

SECTION 615
FILE NO. 42 of 94
SERIAL NO. 11

Order thereon. No 115-68-69 dt 16-3-98 / 1253 Asst to Comptr

The fee allowed by the Decree of the Court in this case being only Rs 252, the payment of this sum to the Govt Advocate is sanctioned ~~under~~ in accordance with para 1 of Govt Proc no. 121-54-Jd dated the 22 Jan 1095.

2. ~~The Collector~~ Under the Orders quoted above, any ~~private~~ advocate employed by Govt is entitled to claim only the fee allowable by law (subject to a minimum of Rs 16) without reference to the number of adjournments. ~~This~~ / ~~In~~ this ~~falling~~ the case there is no reason why the Government Advocate, who is retained by Government ~~by payment~~ on a fixed monthly pay, should claim separate fees for adjournments.

13/3/98

To the Govt Advocate.
The Comptr in Mysore

Seen

Letter to Govt Advocate
dt
13/3/98

Approved
Submitted 15/3
for sanction
Sanctioned

13/3/98

14/3/98

* unless contrary rule have been annexed in the decree in which latter case he may claim the same as well - dt

SECTION 615
FILE No. 42 of 94
SER 12

21

Bangalore
20-11-99.

(15)

My dear Sir

In re Civil Appl. No. 2767
97-98 Veerasangappah & Others
vs.
Mr. V. N. Narasimha Iyengar

the Chief Court pronounced the judgment today dismissing the appeal with costs.

Yours truly
[illegible]

To
C. Sreenivasa Iyengar Esq.
Secy. to the Govt. of Mysore
Rev. & Genl. Depts.

Appl 41295

Dy. No. 5174/2565

22

OFFICE OF THE
GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE IN MYSORE.

SECTION Ls DATED 4 December 1899

No. 101
En. No. 2

FILE No. 420/94

SER AL No. 13

16

From

THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE
IN MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Sir,

I have the honor to report that the Civil Appeal No 276 of 97-98 filed by Y. Veerasangappah + others against Mr V. N. Narsimha Iyengar in the City Court was dismissed with costs. A copy of the decree is annexed herewith.

I enclose herein for sanction a bill for Rs 252-0-0 being the amount of fees for my appearing and conducting the said appeal and request that the Government may be pleased to order payment of the said amount to me

I

I have the honor to be,

Your most obedient Servant.

S Kamaraswamy

Government Advocate

enclosure to Sl 13/16

Decree of Appellate Court.
Section 579, C. P. C.
Form No. 48, Civil.

IN THE Chief COURT OF Mysore AT Bangalore

Present
Mr Justice J. W. Best Chief Judge.
Mr. Justice A. Ramachandra Iyer and Judge

Appeal No. 276 of 1897-98

1. Veerasangappa
2. H. R. Karibasava Sastry
3. Santa veerappa
4. Kutcha veerappa

Appellant. } Vs. { Mr V. N. Narasimha Iyengar

Respondent.

Appeal from the Decree of the Court of the late District Judge Nandidroog Dn dated the 29th day of November 1897.

MEMORANDUM OF APPEAL

Veerasangappa & 20 others Plaintiff.

Mr V. N. Narasimha Iyengar Defendant.

APPELLANTS Veerasangappa & 3 others

The above named appellants to the Chief Court of Mysore against the decree of the late District Judge of Nandidroog Division Original in suit No. 14 of 1895-96 dated the 29th day of November 1897, for the following among other reasons, namely:—

I That the Lower Court erred in finding that the Defendant as Census Superintendent made the remarks Complained of by the Plaintiffs honestly, bonafide and without malice in the discharge of his official duty and that the Plaintiffs' Suit was not maintainable.

II The District Judge while apparently admitting that remarks complained of are of a defamatory nature, erred in law in supposing that the official position of defendant was a sufficient authority to permit him to make uncalled for,

incorrect and insulting statements holding up the Reformer Buswes wara and his followers to public ridicule.

On the passing of Judgment in this appeal in the prosence of

Mr J Evers ——— Advocate for the Appellants and

~~It is ordered and decreed that~~ Mr S. Ramaswamy Advocate for the Respondent.

It is ordered and decreed that this appeal be and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

And it is further ordered and decreed that the appellants 1 Veerasangappa 2. R. R Kanibasava Sastry 3 Santa Veerappa, 4. Hutcha veerappa aforesaid do pay to the Respondent Mr V.R. Narasimha Iyengar aforesaid the sum of Rupees 252-0-0 being the amount of costs incurred by the Respondent aforesaid in this Court with interest thereon at six per Cent per annum from this date until the date of realization.

And it is further ordered and decreed that the ——— aforesaid do pay to the ——— aforesaid the sum of Rupees ——— being the amount of costs incurred in the Lower Court with interest thereon from the date of the decree of the said lower Court to the date of realization.

GIVEN under my hand and seal this 20th day of November 1899.

/Signed/ J. W. Best
Chief Judge

/Signed/ A. Ramachandra Iyer
Judge

(16/a)

MEMORADUM OF COST INCURRED IN THIS APPEAPL

	By the Appellant.			By the Respondent.		
	Rs.	As.	Ps.	Rs.	As.	Ps.
Court Fee on Memo of Appeal	285	"	"	"	"	"
„ Power of Attorney	2	"	"	"	"	"
„ Processes	"	8	"	"	"	"
„ Copies of Decree and Judgment ...	1	8	"	"	"	"
„ Advocate's Fee	252	"	"	252	"	"
„ Cost of Adjournment	"	"	"		"	"
Fees for copying or translating ...	5	1	6		"	"
Printing charges ...	51	8	"		"	"
Total Rs....	597	9	6	252	"	"

True Copy

(Signed) J W Best
Chief Judge

S Ramaswamy

(Signed) A Ramachandra Iyer
Judge

Government Advocate

Advocate for Appellant.

Advocate for Respondent.

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—4-6-98.—4,502.

Draft subd for a/

(17)

Read,

Letter no 101/2 dated the 4th December 1899 from the Government Advocate in Mysore submitting for sanction a bill for Rs 252 being the amount of fees due to him for having conducted the Civil appeal case no 276 of 1897-98 (Y. Veera Sangappa & others vs Mr V. N. Narasimha Iyengar) on the file of the Chief Court.

---

order thereon

No. 7123-5
521-12-99 J663

The bill is sanctioned

SECTION 6
FILE No. 4 of 1899
SER'AL No. 16

Rs 252 allowed
11/12/99

Draft subd
12/12/99

Rs 252 allowed
11/12/99

* his amount has been directed by the Chief Court to be awarded & will have to be recovered from the appellants in the case. See the memo of costs attached to the letter herewith subd.

Subd Hscr.
7/12

Rs 252 are the amount of costs directed in the original Civil Court decree to be paid by the appellants to the respondents. The amount has been paid by the appellants to the respondents. The amount has been paid by the appellants to the respondents.

Sanctioned and transmitted to the Comptroller for audit.

1

Secy:

To,
The Govt. Advocate
in Mysore.
The Comptroller
in Mysore with the
bill.
- Dr. Crimes -
Mysore Dt.
7/12

The Dr. Crimes
Mysore Dt. with be
requested to take
the necessary steps
to recover the
costs payable by the
plaintiffs to the
defts. as per decree
in O. S. No. 14
of 1895/96 on the
file of the D. Judge
Mandy, dated
and by the appellants
& the Respondents in
Appeal No. 276 of 1896
on the file of the Chief
Court of Mysore &
to credit the amounts
to Govt. in due course

19-12

Secy